



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,460	04/19/2005	Karl Tiefenbacher	WEB-42803	8262
24131	7590	10/14/2009		
LERNER GREENBERG STEMER LLP				
P O BOX 2480				
HOLLYWOOD, FL 33022-2480				
EXAMINER				
TRAN LIEN, THUY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,460

Applicant(s)

TIEFENBACHER, KARL

Examiner

Lien T. Tran

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 46-69 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 46-64 and 66-69 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 65 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claims 46-64, 66-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schiffman et al (GB 2228856) in view of Shoop et al (5756140) and Houraney et al (6063413).

Schiffmann et al disclose a brown and serve product and a process of making it. The process comprises the steps of baking yeast-raised products to a point of rigidity without any degree of browning, cooling the baked products, treating the baked product on at least one surface with an aqueous solution of sodium or potassium hydroxide in amount sufficient to provide browning of the treated surface and packaging the treated product in a container. The products are made from dough and include rolls, breadsticks, pretzels, breads or pastries or other such products that are fully formed and prebaked to the exact and size. (see pages 4, 5, 6 ,7 and the examples)

Schiffmann et al do not disclose baking in a baking oven at the temperature claimed, baking to the moisture content and the shaping formation cited in claims 48-55, chilling or freezing the baked pieces cited in claims 59-60, multiple steps of heating as in claims 62-63, mixing the lye with modified starch or modified cereal flour as in claim 66 and chilling or freezing the product before treating with lye as in claims 67-68, the production line of claim 69 and applying a sprinkled material as in claim 47.

Shoop et al teach heating or baking of the coated foodstuff in a regular, convection or microwave oven (see col. 3 lines 15-17)

Schiffmann et al teach packaging the dough product in a flexible container with susceptor to be heated in a microwave oven. It is notoriously well known in the art that microwave baking is the well known alternative to conventional oven baking that

produce quicker heating time. Convection heating and microwave heating are well known alternative heating methods as exemplified in the Shoop et al disclosure. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the well known alternative convection heating when quick heating time is not the objective.. One would be motivated to use conventional heating to reduce the cost of packaging with microwave susceptor. Choosing a well known alternative depending on cost and property desired would have been well within the determination of one skilled in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to bake the product to any varying moisture content depending on the type of product and the degree of doneness desired. It would also have been obvious to one skilled in the art to vary the shaping processing of the dough depending on the type of product made. For example, if a molded shape is wanted, it would have been obvious to shape the dough in a mold. The shaping and moisture content are result-effective variables which can readily be determined by one skilled in the art. It would have been obvious to freeze or chill the baked product prior to treating when long term storage is desired before treating the surface of the product for browning. It would have been obvious to subject the product to multiple steps of heating depending on the degree of browning and the moisture content wanted in the final product. Schiffmann et al disclose additives can be added to the alkaline solution. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add modified starch or flour to the solution when desiring to thicken the solution. Starch and flour are well known thickening agent. It would have been obvious to apply sprinkled material such as salt, spice, sugar etc.. when desiring to enhance the flavor and taste of the products.

Schiffmann et al disclose products such as breadstick, pretzel etc...; there products are notoriously well known in the art to have granular seasoning material on the surface. As to the production line recited in claim 69, Schiffman et al desire for the product to be heated by consumer to have a hot product that is ready for consumption. However, ready to consumed product without any further processing is notoriously well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to carry out the final heating step that gives the product a brown color in the production line if one wants to make a convenient ready to eat product. Such modification depends on the type of product one wants to market and would have readily apparent to one skilled in the art.

Claim 65 is free of prior art for reason of record.

In the response filed 8/7/09, applicant comments that the amendment defines over Schiffman et al. The amended claims do not define over Schiffman et al as explained in the rejection above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lien T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-1408. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on 571-272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

October 11, 2009

/Lien T Tran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794